

The University of Akron IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

11-7-2002

Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting November 7, 2002

Elizabeth Kennedy
facultysenate@uakron.edu

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Elizabeth. "Transcript of the Faculty Senate Meeting November 7, 2002." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 7 Nov 2002. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/115>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 2002

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 7, 2002, in Room 202 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education by Faculty Senate Chair Dan Sheffer.

Fifty-two of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Garcia, Kennedy, Matney, Stinner, Walker, and Wilkinson were absent with notice. Senators Calvo, Graham, Redle, Soucek, and Trotter were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

*** APPROVED APCC'S CHANGES TO RULE 3359-20-031 SALARIES, FULL-TIME FACULTY, AS AMENDED.**

*** APPROVED MOTION THAT THE WELL-BEING COMMITTEE AND THE FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL TAKE UNDER ACTION HOUSE BILL 173.**

*** APPROVED INCLUSION OF ONE ELECTED RETIREE REPRESENTATIVE TO WELL-BEING COMMITTEE.**

*** APPROVED RECOMMENDATION THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINT A TASK FORCE WHICH WILL INCLUDE AT LEAST TWO MEMBERS OF APCC TO INVESTIGATE ISSUES RELATED TO THE CALENDAR RESULTING FROM THE CREATION OF THE 15-WEEK SUMMER SESSION.**

*** APPROVED PROPOSED 2003-04 CALENDAR AND REFERRED THE PRELIMINARY 2004-05 CALENDAR TO THE TASK FORCE.**

*** APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTIONS REGARDING SPACE REALLOCATIONS.**

*** APPROVED LIBRARY RESOLUTION REGARDING LIBRARY BUDGET.**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - Chair Sheffer called for approval of the meeting's agenda. Senator Lee moved to amend the agenda so that Unfinished Business would immediately follow the Special Announcements and come before Reports. This was because the Senate had some items that had been pending since last May which really needed to be addressed. Senator Norfolk seconded this motion, and the body voted its approval.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCT. 3, 2002 - As Secretary Kennedy was absent, Chair Sheffer reported one correction. This was on page 29 of the Chronicle. Senator Norfolk's name had been misspelled; this had been corrected. The body then voted its approval of the minutes.

III. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - Chair Sheffer introduced a new Senator, Maryhelen Kreidler, from Nursing. Senators welcomed her with a warm round of applause. Next, the Chair called for approval the Fall 2002 Commencement Candidates. Marilyn Quillin had the list with her. Senator Harp made the motion to approve; Senator John seconded the motion. The body then voted its approval of the candidates.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The first item of unfinished business was from the APCC, the final draft of 3359-20-031, Salaries full-time faculty (**Appendix A**). Chair Sheffer asked Assoc. Provost Stokes to lead the Senate through this.

Associate Vice Provost Stokes began by stating that Senators would recall a Salaries Task Force established Fall of 2001, charged with tying together the merit increases process with the salary rule as it existed. That task force presented its findings to the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee early in 2002, and APCC determined that it did not like it in that form and wanted to review it some more. So APCC worked on the document all through Spring 2002 and presented it to Faculty Senate in May 2002, and it was postponed until October. In October we ran out of time at that meeting. Thus, the proposal was the draft Senators had had since that time.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion. Senator Witt stated he had a few items which he would take in reverse order, starting with I(4), "Merit procedures shall require that each recommending person or body provide to the faculty member a written explanation of the merit award recommendation." As written, this seemed that there would be three or four letters that would come our way for each faculty member every year; each recommending person - our department head, our chair, our dean. The intent here was for this to happen? This appeared cumbersome, especially in years when the merit pool might not reach the previous year's inflation rate. It would cost more money to write the letters than would be obtained by the raise. Therefore, he proposed the following motion: Replace the words, "each recommending person or body" with the definitions from (C), which was "department chairs, school directors, or deans in colleges without departments." This was seconded by Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh.

Senator W.Yoder then asked whether there could be differences between the letters from deans and department chairs in situations where two letters were written? Assoc. Provost Stokes stated that there would not be a dean's letter unless it was a college without a department. No further discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the amendment with only one nay vote.

Senator Witt continued with I(5) and H(6) which had to do with the appeals process. Both of those elements asked for an appeals process, one for the annual evaluation procedure and then one for the merit procedure. Earlier on in the document, if faculty approved these procedures through deliberation and a vote, most of these arguments would have been resolved in discussions. This would then make an appeal most likely unnecessary. All the faculty would know what to expect from the merit document they created. A grievance, on the other hand, could be filed if those approved procedures were somehow violated, and that would not be an appeal but a regular grievance procedure. And that worked for both H(6) and I(5). In the case of I(5), only in cases where there was violation of faculty-approved merit procedures would a hearing of some kind be necessary. That would fall under existing

grievance procedures. He then proposed an amendment to change the wording in H(6) to read, "Annual evaluations are subject to regular faculty grievance procedures." Then also amend I(5) to read, "Merit awards are subject to regular faculty grievance procedures."

This amendment was seconded by Senator R. Huff. The Chair called for discussion. Senator Lee asked for a better description of the regular grievance procedure for comparison to this amendment.

Senator Witt stated he could speak to that. Up to now without this document, there had been no way to grieve a merit increase, to have that reviewed. There were not mandated procedures in the Faculty Manual. Now that they were there, those procedures like any other rule pertaining to faculty could be reviewed and assessed through the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee. This was pretty well spelled out in the Faculty Manual. Assoc. Provost Stokes added that some colleges had appeals committees that allowed for these kinds of things.

Senator Braun had a question. Could the grievances be only of a procedural nature, or could they be of substantive nature? In the RTP process the grievance was only of a procedural nature. Only the process and not the content could be disputed. To him, that was bothersome. His point was that procedure meant the correct procedure had not been followed. Most of the time the correct procedures were followed, and the problem resided with the decision itself. He would want to be able to actually dispute the decision itself. So the grievances had to be both procedural and substantive in nature. The person who wanted to take action on the grievance had to be able to dispute both the procedure and the decision itself as being followed.

Senator Witt argued that he was having a hard time understanding this. How could we argue that we should get more money out of a merit pool if we in fact knew in advance what we had to do to achieve additional merit points? Senator Braun replied that it was a matter of principle, not a matter of a particular thing. A matter of principle of how the system should be set, that maybe no salary increase was fine. The point was that the principle had to be there in case a faculty member felt wronged. That was what he was advocating.

Senator Jordan then asked whether this were an appeals process within the unit making the decision, whereas the grievance process would be a grievance from the decision that the unit was making? If this was correct, it would eliminate a consideration point by simply going to a grievance process. It was an important decision.

Senator Witt added that the way the rules were written, the appeal would have to be outside the unit and not within it. Assoc. Provost Stokes stated that that was incorrect; the appeals was within the unit.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on this amendment. The motion failed, 24 against and 16 in favor.

Senator Witt then stated that he had one more amendment. This was in D(2), "Academic units may use information from more than one year of annual evaluations in determining salary adjustments." He needed some clarification by what was meant here. Could we in fact, for example, save up achievements and wait for a robust merit pool?

Senator Hebert offered an example from the Business School which used a rolling 3-year average in taking a look at research. Things could be looked at over a longer period of time. Assoc. Provost

Stokes concurred that that was what was meant by this item.

Senator J. Yoder then proposed an alternative to part (D), which stated, "Salary adjustments shall be based on merit." The alternative she proposed would state, "Salary adjustments shall be based at least in part on merit." This would allow use of a full merit criteria if so desired but would give more flexibility for departments and units that might want to use it for something beyond merit. Senator Hebert seconded this amendment.

Senator Gerlach supported the motion but wished it were a little bit more forceful so that it read, "Salary adjustments shall be based on merit and cost of living items." He stated this because he was speaking from what he regarded as his experience as the body's retiree Senator. In 30 some years at this University he had experienced both of these conditions. In more recent years the focus was supposedly exclusively on merit, which he thought unfortunate. Merit was in the eye of the beholder and not always impartial.

Senator Gerlach then quoted Diomedes, "Eyes and ears are poor witnesses when the soul is barbarous." On some occasions unfortunately we had had too many instances of barbarous souls at work. Some combination of these things was the way to go; it was the middle way. He thought it extremely cruel and callous not to make allowances for cost of living. If a faculty member was doing conscientiously his duty, not neglectful in any way and taught his classes, he did not always have a fruitful year in which he had published a dozen books or even one. Yet those who bore down on the publishing would hold him or her to that and say there was no extraordinary merit and therefore no other consideration. That was highly unfair and demoralizing. Therefore, he felt the motion which he supported could be made better. He did not feel it was up to him to do that given his status as a retiree; he was just giving advice.

Chair Sheffer asked whether Senator Gerlach was putting this forth as a friendly amendment to the last impart on merit. Senator Gerlach replied he hesitated to do so based on the virtue of his being a retiree but suggested that if any Senator believed this, he/she might more suitably make that motion.

Senator J. Yoder then stated that her intent was to allow for 100% merit as an option, but to allow then for other possibilities in addition to that. She wanted to keep this motion as it stood at this point unless someone wanted to offer an alternative. No Senator, however, proposed this motion. Therefore, the Chair directed the body's attention back to Senator J. Yoder's original amendment, "Salary adjustments shall be based at least in part on merit."

No further discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote and the Senate passed this amendment.

Senator Witt continued with a motion to delete the statement from H(1)(a) regarding, "An abstention, while allowed, shall be considered as a negative vote."

The Chair called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval of this amendment. Senator Gerlach then proposed an additional amendment to H(7). He wished to strike the word "time" from the phrase, "time period." Senator Gunn seconded this motion. Senate approved this amendment.

Senator Gerlach had another motion regarding item G on the second page. He urged the original edition of Robert's Rules, one that was consistent with the University Senate's bylaws. This original Robert's

was the simplified rule book and it was all that we ever needed. Therefore, he made a motion that the original version of Robert's Rules of Order be accepted instead of the most recent edition. Senator Sugarman seconded this motion.

Senator Hebert then asked for a point of clarification. Typically, when things were updated, it was for clarification. What was the reason that it was not getting better as opposed to getting worse? Senator Gerlach replied that based on his experience, the answer was that it got more and more complicated, complications that were unneeded. Assoc. Provost Stokes added that the RTP process was ruled by the most recent edition of Robert's Rules as determined by the Faculty Senate last year. This was not a Senate rule; this was a University rule. It was not a Senate bylaw so it did not require action. Senator Dechambeau then stated that if electronic voting or anything else electronic took place, the new rules would take precedence over the old rules.

A vote was then taken on this amendment; the motion failed.

Senator W. Yoder then asked that since Senate had removed under 1(a) the reference to abstentions, were there any guidelines in this document to the colleges about how abstentions could be handled? Assoc. Provost Stokes replied, stating that Robert's Rules handled this too. To which Senator Sterns asked whether the Senate had not had a discussion about a year ago on this very point. Chair Sheffer stated, yes, the Senate had had this discussion. Senator Sterns replied that he thought the Senate had decided that an abstention was not a negative vote. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that Robert's Rules stated that - an abstention was a non-vote.

Chair Sheffer called for further discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken on the proposed rule changes. The motion passed with one nay vote.

The Chair then directed the body's attention to the second item of old business. This was a request made by Senator Gerlach at the September meeting. The request was to amend the composition of the University Well-Being Committee so that one Senate representative from the Retirees Assoc. be added as a member of that committee. Senate referred this to the University Well-Being Committee which at last month's meeting of the Senate indicated they would like to introduce this as an amendment if the wording were changed to one representative *elected* by the Retirees Assoc. The simple addition amendment was now on the floor. A motion was now needed to amend the amendment to read, "one representative elected by the Retirees Assoc. Senator Erickson so moved; Senator Steiner seconded her motion. Senator Sugarman asked whether the amendment could be put forward as a friendly amendment. Chair Sheffer replied affirmatively.

Senator Hebert asked for clarification. Would the Retirees Assoc. member be a voting or non-voting member? Chair Sheffer replied that the member would be a voting member.

Senator Harp asked what the composition of the committee was, and who was on it? Senator Erickson replied that the Well-Being Committee was not a Faculty Senate committee but a separately elected committee. As a University committee, it represented all of the constituencies that were represented in the Senate. There was an elected representative from each of the colleges, a representative from contract professionals, from the staff; this would be an extra representative for the retirees. The argument given was that retirees represented a constituency whose well-being was directly affected by the University policy. Faculty members hired before 1992 had their dependents covered by University health insurance upon their retirement. At present there were over 700 persons using this insurance, half

over and half under 65. In the future this number may be greater. The committee considered they should have a vote on issues relating to well-being. They also noted that emeritus retirees had other items that related to well-being - parking, office space, etc. Therefore, the committee considered that they too met the requirements of the constituency whose direct interests were under this particular committee.

Senator Harp expressed concern, as he had done previously with the election from the Retirees Assoc. with dues paying. He thought that all retirees should have the right to vote if this was representing the constituency, just as all staff had the right to vote for staff, all faculty had the right to vote for faculty.

Senator Erickson then pointed out that the staff representatives came from SEAC and she did not know whether all staff automatically belong to SEAC. Senator Schmith replied that SEAC members were elected by the staff.

Senator Erickson then asked Senator Harp whether he wished to make an amendment. He replied that he did not.

Senator Sugarman then spoke, stating that right now there was no representative from the retirees and they did have some interests. Dr. Erickson had invited her to attend some of the meetings so that she could get that information, but without a retiree representative on the Well-Being Committee there was no guaranteed procedure for retirees to comment on any changes that affected them or to give any input and suggestions to the committee. There was no way for communication to take place between that committee and the retirees. She urged all to please vote for that.

She then addressed the idea of all retirees voting of this issue. She thought, procedurally, it would be impossible. Who would pay for it? And how would contact with every single retiree be made? We had the addresses of members of the organization, but not everyone contacted had joined. There were also people that the Assoc. could not find. Senator Sterns interjected that the Dept. of Lifespan and Gerontology maintained a mailing list for all University retirees. His unit sent mail to them; there was a new list that did exist.

Senator Dalton then had one more point. Senator Erickson had stated that the Well-Being Committee represented all constituencies that had interest in University well-being issues. However, there was no student on the committee. While Senator Erickson concurred with Senator Dalton, he did not offer this as a motion to the body.

No further discussion forthcoming on the motion to amend the membership for the University Well-Being Committee by adding an elected representative for the Retirees Assoc., a vote was taken. With only three nays, the Chair stated that this motion passed by the required 60% of the votes of the members of the Faculty Senate who were casting votes.

V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Chair Sheffer gave the report in place of Secretary Kennedy. The Executive Committee met twice during the month of November, once with committee members only, and once with President Proenza, Provost Hickey, and Mrs. Becky Herrnstein. Discussion at those meetings centered primarily on two issues in the budget memo sent from VP of Business and Finance and Chief Financial Officer Roy Ray in the Email Digest dated Oct. 16. As Senators recall, this memo

outlined the University's current budget situation and reported three actions that were to go into effect immediately. The Executive Committee had a concern over notification and timing of the memo. Specifically, our question was, why didn't the PBC as the planning and budgeting committee of the Senate, receive notification first, especially given that their next meeting was the following morning? Apparently, it was a timing issue, that of trying to get the information out to as many as possible simultaneously. Also, these measures were part of discussions that had taken place in the PBC. Vice President Ray thought they had been discussed; this was not a deliberate avoidance of the PBC on his part. Secondly, the Balanced Scorecard initiative was addressed. Group discussion of the status of the University project occurred with the Executive Committee providing feedback as to how the special meeting held in October had been received by Senators and other faculty present. Some future goals were outlined for the Executive Committee as well. Finally, the Executive Committee had referred to APCC, CRC and PBC the college proposal from Director Dale Mugler to study the feasibility and report back to the APCC.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - Chair Sheffer then invited President Proenza to deliver his remarks to the body.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the same spirit that our good colleague Senator Gerlach offered an amendment to remove time from time period, I might suggest - what was that phrase you used, Senator Gerlach, 'Believe you me.'

Colleagues, good afternoon, and let me share a couple of points of information with you. As you know, our nation, our state, has been occupied for the last several months with political campaigns for various offices. Those were concluded a few days ago, and so we move forward. Importantly for this body and for this University is the fact that during this campaign for the first time in a long time it was a consistent evidence of higher education being on the minds of most of our potentially-to-be- elected officials that is noteworthy. The first year I was in Ohio I don't believe that a single elected official honored in any campaign speech or in any related rhetoric the words higher education, or university, or college, etc. Two years ago during the midterm elections I daresay that mention was minimal, if at all.

By contrast, during this election I think you saw that very prominently an issue. I certainly didn't count and compile a statistical profile, but it was very prominent. Certainly in gubernatorial candidates, certainly in many of the state and Senate representative bodies, it is on the public agenda.

The Governor during his own statements which presumably we can now look for some action, talked about two issues, one very encouraging, one troubling. The encouraging part is that he intended, and I stress continues to intend to propose a budget for the next biennium which would include an increase for higher education. I look forward to seeing what his recommendation is and will endeavor to work with him and his staff as well as with the Board of Regents to be sure that the recommendation from his office is as high as it can possibly be, and to subsequently work with our legislative representatives to see that appropriate special allocations that might come to The University of Akron are considered seriously.

The second recommendation is a little less appealing, and that is that both in Mr. Higgins' remarks and of course he is unable to act upon those, but also in Mr. Taft's remarks was the notion that some form of tuition caps might return. Please do not misunderstand me, I am not in favor of just raising tuition for the sake of raising tuition. That is wholly inappropriate. The facts of the condition of our state are very simply these: The state's per capita support for higher education ranks 41st in the nation. The state's average expenditure net cost of providing a higher education are slightly below the national average.

But because state appropriations are 41st well below the national average, is it any surprise that tuition is the 8th highest in the nation and I think rose to 7th this past year? No, no surprise. The single most cited reason in every state I've been following to find information about rising tuition costs in public education is diminished state appropriations, pure and simple. So again, in that context, the suggestion that tuition caps might return are troubling, not just for the sake of tuition caps, per se, because without the accompanying increase in state support, tuition caps would not be answered.

You also are well aware that because we have such a range of tuitions in the state, from 7,600 at one end to about 3,800 at the lower end, imposing a percentage cap on tuition is grossly unfair. Six percent of a large number is always a larger number than 6% of a smaller number -it follows mathematics. So in any case, let us be optimistic and let us work very hard towards enabling some dialogue. Again, I ask that if it's possible for you to personally direct a letter on your own stationery from home, etc., to your state representative or senator about higher education for the state of Ohio, I think it would be important for you to do so.

In that context, during this past several months State Representative Jim Hughes and a committee that he assembled went around the state receiving testimony about various issues regarding higher education. We were asked to present testimony, and Senior VP & Provost Hickey delivered that testimony on my behalf at Dennison University. Surprisingly, he tells me because during the time he was presenting the testimony the committee was eating their lunch, they appeared to have listened.

As a result, they invited Provost Hickey to communicate to me their desire to receive a white paper with more detail on the recommendations that I outlined in that paper as well as commentary from us on the formula. I am in the midst of preparing that document, and I have given your chairman a copy of it which I would invite him to chat with you about. It is not ready for comprehensive circulation, but I've asked for feedback to be given back to me by November 22. At this time I will finalize the document and submit it to Representative Hughes.

The document is also being reviewed at this point by the IUC, that is the other university presidents, some of whom aren't likely to like it by the IUC legislative representatives who know more about how these messages are received, by the Board of Regents staff, and tomorrow I will be sending it to the members of the Board of Regents alone. It makes some strong recommendations, and I trust based on the input of my colleagues that they're well supported. But as with many things that we do in life, there is no guarantee of course that one particular event is the one that succeeds. Anyway, the paper is circulating, and I do invite your chairman to discuss it with you.

Let me just close with three observations about notable achievements at the University. Cynthia Capers is here, and I'm informed that you've received laudatory comments from the State Nursing Association, and congratulations on that. Equally, and is there any representative here from the College of Education? Three of you; congratulations. If I'm informed correctly, you're the first university in Ohio in recent years to receive laudatory comments on all six of the new accrediting performance standards that the NCATE examines. More to the point, the representatives from the State Board of Regents who assist in this process and the State Board of Education complimented our programs and said that they would be touting them as a model to others. Last night Dean Stroble in a most appropriate way of communicating these achievements, while presiding over a dinner received three phone calls from none other than The Ohio State University, Cincinnati, and Oberlin. So we have something to teach these good people.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, it is notable that in the 2002 USA Today, the NCAA Academic Achievement Award showed The University of Akron to be ranked nationally in one of three categories of Division IA for academic performance. They finished fifth in the U.S. when comparing the graduation rates of our athletes as compared to the overall student body. Thank you, and I welcome any questions you may have."

Senator Steiner then addressed the President. As President Proenza might recall, at the last Senate meeting Senator Steiner had asked about when the previous year's budgets would be rolled over to the departments to use. Vice President Ray had indicated that there was a difficulty with PeopleSoft and that the rollover would probably happen within a week to ten days. Senator Steiner had just been informed that that still had not yet happened. Given the memo which stated that 20% of last year's budget would be held back was now in circulation, could an update be given on the status of that? President Proenza asked Mr. Hank Nettling to respond in Vice President Ray's absence. Mr. Nettling replied that the last he had heard was that the testing had been completed and budgets should be coming forward. President Proenza then asked Senator Steiner to provide his email to Mr. Nettling so that the moment it was done, Senator Steiner would have that communication.

Senator Dalton then stated he had a question about scholarship funding for academic scholarships. When he started here he received a scholarship for excellence. It was a certain amount meant to pay tuition and room and board expenses. This semester he ended up having to pay \$1,560. That was an additional scholarship he received from his fraternity. His scholarship ran out at the end of the year; it was really not going to affect him. But he was wondering about these other students coming in that had been told that that was going to cover their tuition and expenses, at the same time student activity dues were going up to pay for athletes to cover their room and board and their tuition. It seemed that a priority was being placed on athletics as opposed to our students that were coming here specifically for academics.

President Proenza addressed Senator Dalton's statement. He pointed out that the state of Maryland was considering a very large increase in tuition, something like 40%. And while that did not address his immediate concern, each time that the University increased fees, etc., we did increase the financial aid and scholarship budget. Not all scholarships covered the difference because some of them were fixed dollar amounts. Those were reviewed periodically, as for example when the endowment enabled us to adjust it to a new level or additional donations came up to par. Many scholarships were labeled tuition and would cover that tuition. Other scholarships were \$1,000 or \$5,000 scholarships. Whatever the level, and, obviously, depending on the value, it either covered a great deal or not enough. With regard to the student fees, while a certain proportion did go to athletics, it was in keeping with previous years. Again, each time there was an increase, a comparable increase was made to the student financial aid budget. We never increased a tuition without increasing the student financial aid/scholarship budget by a comparable amount.

Senator Dalton replied that he knew of scholarships that had not been adjusted for four years.

President Proenza replied that as he had said, not all of them got adjusted simultaneously. The scholarships for excellence had been a fixed-dollar amount. However, it was probably time that we did so. He then asked the Provost and Vice President Roney, both of whom were present, to be sure that all of the scholarships for tuition receive attention and review.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair then invite Provost Hickey to deliver his remarks to the Senate.

"First, so there's no misunderstanding, the calls that Dean Stroble got last night should remind you of the old Bob Newhart telephone routines, so Beth would've done Bob Newhart proud. I don't really think her phone rang, but she has actually gotten calls from all of the institutions she mentioned last night and others asking whether they could come up and essentially learn from the College of Education.

What I would like to tell you about today is the second phase of the first year's compression allocation. I see Jack Braun so I have to be very careful how I choose my words here so that I get it correct. If you remember, we kept some money back in a reserve fund from the first phase that we did earlier in the fall semester with the understanding that once the dust settled from that, we would do a second round of allocations. There was approximately \$170,000 left in the reserve pool after the first phase of round one.

The Academic Salary Affairs Task Force decided to allocate those dollars to associate professors in the hopes of bringing associate professors to the median position among the state benchmark institutions. You'll remember that our assistant professors are at the 75th percentile of those benchmark institutions.

Phase one of round one brought full professors to the median position, but only moved associate professors from the 9th position to the 8th position. Our calculation was by focusing the \$170,000 on associate professors, we could bring them to or very near the median point among our state benchmark institutions, and that is in fact what we have done.

The worksheets went out to the deans early this week. I already have several of the worksheets back, so the allocations will be made and those second-phase round one allocations will be in effect retroactive to the same start dates as phase one round one. So those getting increases will get a check sometime in the future, and I won't say when because I don't know how long it will take, but when you get it you'll have a lump sum payment going back to the retroactive start date and then your salary will be increased on a monthly basis as prescribed by the new increase.

Now the calculations that the Task Force has done, and I shared this with the campus community earlier this week in an email message, moves the average salary of associate professors from the eighth position to the sixth position in the state. Now we have to get to the fifth position to be at the median, so we didn't get quite to the median but we are approximately \$150-170 on average per associate professor away from the median position, so we came very close. We moved past Ohio University and the University of Cincinnati in our associate professors.

So after the first year's allocation of the compression money we have the full professors at the median position and we have the associate professors very close to the median position. That will end the first year's allocation.

The sum of \$1.2 million was set aside, and all but \$8,000 of that has been used. Some was kept back, again in case there are appeals that are bound to have merit that we can deal with. I'm not inviting appeals; with only \$8,000 left that won't go very far, but I hope with your understanding we are not going to do a third phase of round one to distribute \$8,000. We can add that to next year's allocation if it's not taken up in the appeals process.

Let me again thank the Academic Salary Affairs Task Force for the job they have done. It has been a

very difficult and time-consuming job, and they've done an excellent job of it. Now their task is to, and I've had to keep Chand rather focused because he now wants to take on every analyses known to man, and he can do that but we have to do them one at a time. The next task is to model what we're going to have to do on an annual basis in order to get all faculty to at least the 75th percentile, and that in turn will guide us and guide the PBC as we try to identify and set aside the amount of money necessary to continue these compression allocations until we have reached at least the 75th percentile. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Senator Hebert then addressed the Provost. There were a number of deans that were under review this year. From the faculty's perspective, that process seemed a little ambiguous. He wondered whether at this time or maybe in a published form the Provost could share with us the factors that were being considered and the weights that were attached to those factors in the reviews of deans.

To which, Provost Hickey replied that there were a standard set of questions that were sent out for people to answer. Associate Provost Stokes could certainly share copies of those questions. The Provost stated that he then looked at the input that came back from all of the stakeholders including those within the college, input from other deans, input from vice presidents, input from community members, and weigh all of that information. He could not tell what weights he put on any individual item because there were no particular weights. He looked at the information in toto and tried to make an evaluation about how well the dean was doing his or her job. So, he could not share any specific weights; he would be happy to share the questionnaires that were sent out. Those were no secret because they were sent out to a large number of people. His office had sought broad input this year from people whether we should change, add to, or amend the questions that we sent out. They had gotten some feedback and made some changes based on that feedback.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson began her report (**Appendix B**), by asking all Senators to be sure to pick up a copy of her report. It contained the recommendations that were passed in the May meeting of the Senate that related to health care. The committee was trying to follow through on those recommendations.

She continued. The committee had met twice in the past month; the chair also had met with PBC at their Sept. 24 meeting. We received reports from Desnay Lohrum from Human Resources who was the ex officio, non-voting member of our committee. She reported on enrollment and noted that the retiree dependents now had the option of staying on the PPO or with Kaiser HMO, which would reduce the cost to the University. The committee did not know yet the result of that. Only Kaiser put in a bid that was acceptable. Summa said they would do so but at a cost greater than traditional indemnity, so they were not included.

Desnay Lohrum also reported on the discussions with Steve Likovich of Watson Wyatt. Human Resources needed an effective cost-tracking system. This system was extraordinarily important if the committee tried to follow the Senate recommendations mentioned above. Steve Likovich is putting in a cost estimate. To do so, he needs an estimate of the potential health care cost increase for next year. The Well-Being committee needs to start working on that and put bids out before spring. It needed to be taken to the Board in August.

As for the dental contract, it appeared that they were running 15% above the estimated costs. Summa, who changed its HMO for one year, added another 15%. That, in addition to all of the outside things the committee had been looking at, suggested strongly a 15% annual increase in health care costs at the

moment nationwide. That meant that as it was a 2-year contract, potentially there could be a 30% increase.

She continued. The committee also had asked that PBC stay in contact with the Well-Being Committee. There should be interaction here because it was PBC that needed to make the overall decision on how much of a health care cost was to be absorbed by the University budget. This meant giving up other things as well as coming up with employee premiums. Senate recommended that there should be a cap on the percentage (as determined by the Well-Being Committee) of total medical costs to be paid by employees and that the contribution should only be initiated when we got salaries to the median. However, the committee had not yet addressed this further.

They were, however, asking PBC to give their input. As Chair, she had spoken at a meeting of PBC to recommend how much of any increase should be absorbed by the University and whether Well-Being would need to work on premiums that would reduce the benefit plan. If Senators recalled, the committee had said there should be one plan that did not involve a premium but maybe had reduced health benefits instead. We felt PBC needed to decide the overall tradeoffs necessary in the budget. So the committee has initiated dialogue with PBC.

The final item concerned trying to do something about wellness within our own University. It was very costly to outside vendors. The committee had spoken with Rachelle Kappler of Zip Fit and also our nursing representative who was prepared to be on this ad hoc committee. Anyone who had any recommendations for people to examine was being sought.

GRADUATE COUNCIL - Senator Drew began her report (**Appendix C**), by stating that Graduate Council had three items to report to the Senate. The first item was that Graduate Council at their last meeting had voted to approve curriculum proposals from Education, Engineering, and Nursing and had voted to approve revised graduate faculty membership criteria from Geology, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, Public Administration & Urban Studies, Theoretical & Applied Mathematics, Counseling, and Educational Foundations and Leadership. At that last meeting, Dr. Newkome continued the discussion of the numerous issues associated with the state imposed 85% funding cap for Ph.D. students. Dr. Newkome emphasized that the University needed to align its courses to allow for appropriate state subvention for masters- and doctoral-level courses. Also, the Graduate School would curtail stipend and tuition remission for all graduate students who were ineligible for state subvention. Accordingly, the revised rules (effective Spring semester 2003) covering graduate student tuition remission and stipends were presented for Senators' review. These rules were: 1) No scholarships for tuition remission will be awarded after the 14th day of any semester or session; 2) Students in their first or second year of support will receive up to 15 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and over the combined summer sessions; 3) Students in their third year or greater of support will receive up to 9 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and up to 6 graduate credit hours remitted over the combined summer sessions; 4) Under no circumstances will the Graduate School provide stipends or tuition remission to a student who has acquired 174 or greater graduate credit hours, or 140 or greater graduate credit hours and has a graduate degree from another institution.

Senator Sterns then had a question for Senator Drew. He stated that there were some programs on campus that combined degrees with additional qualifications, such as the certificate in gerontology, which was always allowed for extra credit hours. What this meant was that we were closing down a very used option.

Provost Hickey then offered to explain the reasons for that, given that Dr. Newkome was not present. As far as the state was concerned once a graduate student got to 174 credit hrs., he/she did not exist. The University got no state support whatsoever for a student once he/she passed 174 credit hrs. For all sitting there thinking, how in the world could a graduate student accumulate 174 credit hrs., there were graduate students on the books with almost 300 credit hrs. taken as a graduate student. We had graduate students on the books with over 170 credit hrs. who had not gotten a masters degree yet. There were a significant number of graduate students who we were not getting any state support or credit because of the number of credit hrs. they had accumulated.

Senator Erickson then asked for a point of clarification. This was a report from the Graduate Council about rules that were apparently going into force. Did not this material have to come to the Faculty Senate? Did not this have to be passed by Faculty Senate, as it was her understanding that it did.

Senator Drew replied that she was not positive about that but could check. It had come to her from Heather Blake who was the secretary of Graduate Council. Chair Sheffer then stated that the Executive Committee would take this up at their next meeting as to whether the Senate needed to rule on this or discuss it.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Before Assoc. Provost Stokes began her report, she pointed out to the body that another item from the Salaries rule (voted upon earlier) needed to be addressed. This item was under I(1)(a) which contained a sentence about abstentions that should be eliminated. If so directed, APCC could just go ahead and do so. No objections arising from the body, Chair Sheffer asked that that be done.

Assoc. Provost Stokes began her report by stating that APCC had two items to bring to Senator's attention. In the form of a motion we had changes to the bypassed credit policy (**Appendix D1.**). This was brought to the attention of the committee to address the issue that there was nothing in the policy that said what happened if a student was unsuccessful in their attempt at bypassed credit. So the change in the policy addressed that question and was brought to the body as a motion.

Senator Norfolk then commented on the motion. He stated that the students that he had known applied for bypassed credit after they passed the course. This was not a major thing. Students waited until they passed the course and then asked for the bypassed credit. This change was not substantial from the perspective of our courses. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that it was not the case anymore.

The Chair called for further discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote of the motion to approve the revised bypassed credit policy. The body then voted its approval.

Assoc. Provost Stokes continued by stating that the second issue was from the calendar part of APCC. Each year APCC brought to Senate a proposed calendar for the upcoming academic year and a preliminary calendar for the second year. There was considerable discussion this year over the academic calendar, particularly the starting date and the question of a break between summer session and fall semester. We had visitors from Student Affairs come and discuss this with us, and the final decision of the Calendar Committee was to present the calendar as attached (**Appendix E**). There was a week that would come between summer and fall in 2004-05 and because of the issues raised, APCC also recommends the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate appoint a task force which will include at least two members of APCC to investigate issues related to the calendar that results from the creation of

15-week summer session. That recommendation was also part of the request for approval of the proposed and preliminary calendars and this comes as a motion to Faculty Senate.

Chair Sheffer provided clarification by stating there were two motions; the first to approve the proposed calendar for 2003-04 and the preliminary 2004-05. He then called for discussion.

Senator Hebert wanted to point out to the committee that if the spring semester started on Monday, Jan. 5, we would also get a break between the spring and summer if we only took three weeks instead of four at Christmas time. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that that was correct but would mean that the faculty would only have three weeks instead of four. That was one of the issues that could be addressed by the task force, the shortening of the winter break. APCC was not prepared to recommend that as a blanket proposal without an investigation. Senator Hebert stated he would at least like some consideration to shortening the Christmas break in order to get a week between spring semester and the beginning of the summer term. It was very difficult to go through finals and start those summer sessions very quickly. They were very intense and that week was very important in terms of preparation, etc., particularly if one was teaching in the first summer session.

Senator Dalton then wanted to comment. He stated that he had been talking to a lot of students lately about the creation of a possible fall break. The fall break would probably be a 2-day break. This would be similar to such schools as Case Western that had a study period before their exams. It staggered exams but it was an idea of how to fit the calendar. Chair Sheffer indicated it would be a good idea to have student representation on the task force.

Senator Hebert then made the motion that the Spring semester be moved back a week to the 5th of January and finish on May 2, with start-up on the 10th. This was seconded by Senator Maringer.

Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that there was the consideration of graduation and commencement. EJ Thomas Hall had already been scheduled 10 years in advance. Honestly, it was for that long; it was uncertain as to whether the hall was available. So this was a serious consideration.

Senator Wyszynski spoke against the motion, suggesting that we wait to find out what other possible ramifications there were other than having to move the graduation ceremony.

Senator Lee stated that in the past there had been glitches or mismatches between the general calendar and the calendar at the Law School. He wanted to get a better chance to look at this and compare it to their current plan. Could the urgency of approving this be put off?

Senator Braun then wanted to speak against the amendment. There were colleges that were not using the first session but going to sessions 2 and 3. Between sessions 2 and 3 and the fall semester there was already just one week. Curtailing also the winter break when a lot of people actually caught up with things they were not able to do during the semester in terms of research, writing papers, and so forth, would make it very difficult to actually perform certain duties that were performed during the winter break. Alternatively, what I would like to propose would be to have a differentiated date when various colleges started for spring semester.

Chair Sheffer then pointed out to Senator Braun that he was not speaking directly to the amendment on the floor. Chair Sheffer asked whether there were anyone who wished to speak directly to the amendment.

Senator Gerlach made the motion that Senator Hebert's motion be referred to the task force and to be considered as part of this other business. Senator Dechambeau seconded the motion. However, upon discussion that Senator Gerlach's motion would result in sending the entire calendar to the task force, Senator Gerlach asked for unanimous consent from the body to withdraw his motion. However, there was one objection, so the Senate had to vote on the motion. Senator Dechambeau asked for the date that the calendar had to be fixed. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that the Board had to approve it at the December Board meeting, which was before the next Faculty Senate meeting. Thus far, Senate had only approved the preliminary calendar.

Senator Steiner then suggested that Senate not refer this entire calendar to the committee which did not exist yet, but rather, make a decision on the 2003-04 calendar now, and perhaps at a later time refer this issue to APCC.

No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken on the motion to refer. The motion failed.

Senator Sterns then stated that one of the reasons for this long winter break was certain cost savings in heating. So the question was, was there any real cost saving as one of the reasons for this long winter break, and was this still in effect?

Senator Dalton then stated that he knew students would be in favor of it. Students only needed three weeks, in all honesty.

Senator Steiner wished to speak against the amendment. He thought at this time for the 2003-04 calendar Senate approve it as it stood but consider all the other issues raised. Those were things that should be sent with our referral to the committee.

Provost Hickey then added that at the very least, if the amendment went forward, it had to be pending the University's ability to get EJ Thomas to reschedule commencement. If we could not do that, then there was really no way to do this. Senator Hebert stated he would accept that as a friendly amendment but on the other hand did not see why the graduation immediately after the end of finals was important. If it happened the next week, it happened the next week. Provost Hickey replied that the problem was that many students would depart and we would end up with a very small graduation ceremony. Senator Hebert replied that everybody lived within 50 miles of the University. However, in deference to the Provost, he would accept the friendly amendment. This was seconded by Senator Maringer. The amended amendment was to move the start of the January 2004 semester to January 5 pending the ability to have graduation at the appropriate time, one week earlier.

Senator Harp then asked whether he could call the question on the amendment. Chair Sheffer replied that he could unless there was an objection. He could move the previous question with a two-thirds vote if it was approved. Or, he could wait until the debate was over and then we could vote on it. No further discussion forthcoming, a vote on the amendment to move the spring 2004 semester back one week pending the ability to move graduation back one week was taken. The motion failed.

Senate returned to the recommendation to approve the proposed calendar 2003-04 and preliminary calendar 2004-05.

Senator Steiner moved that the body approve the proposed 2003-04 calendar but refer the preliminary 2004-05 to the task force. Senator Erickson seconded this motion.

The body then voted its approval of this motion as well as the recommendation that the Executive Committee appoint a task force to investigate the calendar issues raised. The body approved both.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Assoc. Provost Stokes began with a point of information which had been sent to department chairs and members of colleges who did the curriculum system. The default setting and the curriculum proposal system were now set to check prereq.'s. Prior to this it was set to not automatically check prereq.'s. So if a proposal was going into the system and prereq.'s were not wished to be checked, there was a box that had to be clicked. This had caused considerable confusion, but the default had been changed. She would send this information out to everyone.

Next, there was a proposed change to rule 3359-20-052, curriculum changes (**Appendix E**). This was being brought as a motion from Curriculum Review Committee. It was discovered by CRC that there was no procedure by which new programs were reviewed by the University, the Curriculum Review Committee, the Provost, or anybody before the proposal went to the Ohio Board of Regents. The CRC felt that we should at least see those before they got sent off to the Board of Regents. Therefore, the committee had put language in here to accommodate that.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The motion passed.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report (**Appendix F**), by stating that the committee had had many follow-up activities. He was happy to report on an excellent updating session with Mr. Curtis, our Vice President for Capital Planning & Facilities Management, who brought us up-to-date on all of the activities, construction, and other issues the committee had not been apprised of for a long time. Probably the most important thing was the documentation and complete review of campus moves and space assignment. There were 8-pages worth of documented moves which he had not formally included here. He began with the first resolution: **The Faculty Senate endorses the reassignment of space in Olin, Carroll, Ayer Halls and Polsky building which resulted from the opening of the College of Arts & Sciences Building during Summer 2002. Ayer and Carroll Halls will temporarily house units being displaced when Gardner Student Center is demolished for Phase II of the Student Center project. In addition, relocations for Whitby Hall (primarily Chemical Engineering) during its renovation and moves from Leigh Hall (primarily to Polsky Building) due to the renovation are also endorsed. A full document on file with the committee.**

Senate approved this resolution.

Senator Sterns continued with the next item which was the request for incubator space. As part of the activities of The University of Akron Research Foundation, there was a formal request that the Superior Auto Body Service Building, which consists of 17,000 square feet, be available to support activities or creating the University incubator facility for faculty and community start-up companies. So the resolution read as follows: **The Faculty Senate supports the assignment of space for the creation of a University incubator facility for faculty and community start-up companies.**

No further discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the resolution. Senator Sterns read the next CFPC resolution: **The Faculty Senate supports the assignment of service/storage**

space in the Student Administrative Services Building. Senate voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns then offered some positive support to the creativity of Mr. Haskell and his associates, because in their development of the revisions and improvements in Schrank Hall N. & S. they had been able to develop an approach where people would be able to stay in their respective office areas and not have to move to temporary space. That was very helpful. That meant that the concern of the committee regarding the use of the former Psychology Counseling Clinic as a potential place for the counseling and testing bureau could now be released. Thus, the committee asked the approval for the following resolution: **The Faculty Senate supports the temporary assignment of Polsky 327 A-F and 325 F for use by Benefits Administration.**

The body voted its approval of this resolution.

Senator Sterns then congratulated George Newkome, the Provost and the President in the movement towards this incubator. It was a wonderful new step forward for our campus.

Senator Gerlach then asked whether Campus Facilities Planning Committee was considering the issue concerning Simmons Hall, or was it just killing it? Senator Sterns replied that it would be his pleasure to respond. First, based on our discussion last time, the committee had generated a document outlining the work of Donfred Gardner and forwarded that on to the President. The Simmons issue was ongoing; the committee did not discuss it at our last meeting. Senator Sterns reported that he had had a telephone conversation with President Simmons' daughter about three weeks ago. She called me about what was happening. He had made an appropriate referral to Mrs. Graves and Mr. Laguardia as well as saying that he personally would look into things himself. We were in the process of developing another statement regarding the history and reasons why the Simmons name should be perpetuated. The committee had not formally addressed it yet, however.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - Senator Harp began his report (**See Appendix G**). The Libraries Committee would like to confirm formally that our library no longer bought books. There was information that \$100,000 had become available from Dr. Gaylord's budget. These monies had been set aside for special projects that would take care of things in the library that Dean Del Williams had called "onesies." These would be special requests, teaching-related, and potentially research-related. But there would not be a reinstitution of the automatic purchase plan. That would cost us. Even the paired down plan we had had for years, at least \$400,000, was not in the budget.

Senators could review this on the expenditures page (pg. 50). The \$36,000 Senators saw there should cover a few monograph series. These were ongoing commitments to be sure that the monograph series continued. A noteworthy fact came from Associate Dean Roger Durbin of the library. This was that, if the current rate of serials' inflation continued, even if we only bought serials and no books, the library acquisitions budget would virtually deplete our library acquisitions budget in the next five years. That says something about the rate of inflation in general. This was obviously an enormous danger to our institution for undergraduate programs, for graduate programs, for everything. The committee thought it to be out of sync with our desire to be a premiere university in Ohio.

Senator Harp then referred to his written report. The attached data, put together by our librarians, would track expenditures for the past ten years. The tables provide a look at where we stood vis-a-vis

other institutions including those we would consider already to be our inferiors, certainly our desired inferiors over the next ten years. The institution to keep an eye on was Cincinnati, which by and large doubled us in all respects, since that was the kind of institution we aspire to be.

He continued by stating that the Libraries Committee had not decided to recommend some kind of short-term fix. We intended to come in every year or two or three to recommend some kind of "bandaid," forcing money to be moved from personnel, which was already pathetic. The Libraries Committee would be supportive of any short-term budget, should Dr. Gaylord come up with another \$300,000. The committee did want to focus the Senate's attention on the possibility of a longer-term solution, one tied to the norms of the Association of Research Libraries and to this resolution: **The Libraries Committee strongly recommends that the Faculty Senate charge the Planning and Budgeting Committee to ensure sufficient funding to raise the library within the next decade to the status of a research library as defined by the Association of Research Libraries.**

He had seen different norms as to how much that would cost. He had been told it was \$12 million. Kent right now, skating on past success and beefing up their budget with gathering old volumes in, was getting by with \$8 million. But our library budget was still only \$5-6 million; we were bested by Kent by about \$2-3 million per annum. In short, the Libraries Committee believed strongly that the library must be treated as a fundamental part of attaining status as a premiere research university. It was as important as salaries, benefits, an adequate physical plant, and strong academic programs. Without a strong library we could not be a strong university.

On the second issue, the Libraries Committee also discussed various proposals that had been submitted to us, recommending that the administration move the library from the domain of the Vice President for Information Services to that of Senior Vice President and Provost. Those discussions were ongoing; there was not a formal recommendation at this time. Senator Harp then called for Senate support of the committee's resolution.

President Proenza had a comment and a question. First, he wanted to thank the Senator for his report. Those were very important issues that we needed to look at. He did wonder, however, whether you had had some discussions with Vice President Newkome about the special elections that were accruing to our library and what difference those make. Equally and very importantly, there were two other considerations that he would ask be entertained very carefully. There was no question that the price of serials was outpacing anybody's capacity for keeping up with it and was rivaled perhaps only by health care issues. In that context, a couple of questions for information basis. First, the question of what linkages existed through the other networks in the state that enabled us to access the other materials virtually. Secondly, the linkage very importantly that was being made today with information technology not only to reduce costs but to in fact expand access. President Proenza felt it to be very important that the Libraries Committee continue to look at that so we did not lose track of it. While he was not opposed to considering movement of responsibility, unless more money was found, that movement did not buy what he thought was wanted.

Senator Harp responded that he had not talked directly with Dr. Newkome about that. As for the linkages, we discussed that at length in terms of the access, particularly for downloading serials. It worked relatively effectively for serials; the OhioLink was part of this journals data. It worked effectively for serials because one could hit a button and download it. For books, which parts of Social Sciences and Humanities used almost exclusively, or for serials, the only thing that could be done was to order the serials through interlibrary loans. That cost money. For books, one would have to order the

book. If it were a book referenced to regularly, that cost was then getting pushed either back onto the students or to the departments. For students, provided we could get them to use OhioLink, as there was a learning curve even for some of our best students, that put the cost of time and money on their backs, with them standing at a photocopy machine. What departments were doing in Arts & Sciences was putting a staff person in front of a photocopy machine and copying chunks of books. We had been doing that for years and OhioLink had definitely improved things. What we were talking about at this point was a situation where a researcher or a student literally would have almost all of their books on a topic from our own institution. That eliminated the possibility of browsing, but either you spent a huge budget on photocopying those materials to use or you spent it on buying the book. The accumulated cost might well be comparable.

Senator Lee then expressed a concern. He thought it was really important and was a good goal, but the Libraries committee had presented in this motion as a charge to PBC to ensure. That did not seem to allow any flexibility. He read this to mean that PBC had to ensure this regardless what the impact might be on health care premiums, any tradeoff on salaries, on any other budget priorities we might have. This seemed inflexible. He would like to make an amendment which would state that the Libraries Committee strongly recommended that the Faculty Senate instruct the Planning & Budgeting Committee that it was an important priority to ensure funding. He thought it important to ensure some flexibility. This was seconded by Senator Jordan.

Senator Covrig then said it seemed unnecessary because the particular resolution did not have all the teeth of specific goals. He did not see why this friendly amendment was necessary. Chair Sheffer corrected him; it was not a friendly amendment but an amendment.

No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken. The amendment failed.

Senator Kreidler then stated that having sat on her first PBC meeting, this body could not make a resolution to ensure anything. Because the Senate did not pass the amendment, we could not pass this resolution. PBC could not do this. Senator Hoo Fatt stated it was within the next decade. That was ten years. It did not have to be in the next year. She did not see why we could not do this in ten years.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on the motion. Senate then voted its approval of the motion with one dissention.

Senator Dechambeau then commented. She wanted to make sure that it was understood that thinking about electronic journals as a replacement for paper subscriptions was not in fact necessarily a cheaper substitution. Quite often it was much more expensive. Canceled subscriptions meant losing the back issues. The beauty of the electronic journal center in OhioLink was that they maintained the back issues for us. This was a common concept that people had, that we could get it electronically for free or for less.

Senator Witt then stated he wished to know a little bit more about all the options for the library, as he thought that electronic options were more economical. Senate could use a little education on this.

Chair Sheffer then stated that Senator Harp had now been charged with educating the Senate on this issue.

Senator Sterns added that he thought we should also keep in mind that there were many ramifications.

There were certain certification bodies that reviewed the status of certain honoraries, evaluated library holdings, as well as many other ramifications that happened from not maintaining our library. It could begin to effect our academic programs if we were not careful. He was sure that was an obvious thing but did want to say it formally.

Senator Harp continued with a report that was prepared by Associate Dean Roger Durbin. He could get the electronic version and make that available to Senators. That report specified some of the ARL (Association for Research Library) measures. More importantly, it dealt with the issues involved in these determinations and the kinds of measures we might use over time to assess how our library was doing, much like had been done with the issue of salaries.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - See (**Appendix H**) for report and 2002 Fall Grants.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Fenwick stated that in light of the time, he was going to waive the oral report (**See Appendix I for written report**). He did, however, ask that Senators look at the appended report from Ernst & Young (pg. 56). He wanted to make just two points about that. One, it was not Arthur Anderson. He had hoped that Vice President Ray would be here to explain. This was the one item about the state of Ohio notifying colleges and universities of potential workers' comp. liability.

President Proenza then noted that both Vice President Nettling and Vice President Mallo were present. With permission, VP Mallo then addressed the body. He stated that currently all state universities paid a premium with regard to worker's compensation for the claims they experienced over the course of a year. But the State Auditor was proposing to book the liabilities on the state books and to apportion those to all the state universities. So basically it would affect the bottom line of our balance sheet.

Senator Fenwick then asked to what extent.

Vice President Mallo replied that we were still in negotiations with the State Auditor and Attorney General. We thought that if we were able to do it as a footnote as opposed to the bottom line, it would have negligible effect. Senator Fenwick then asked when we would know. To which Vice President Mallo replied that discussions were going on this week on this very issue. Senator Fenwick stated that other than that, PBC would probably have preliminary reports from two subcommittees on ROI next month

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - See (**Appendix J**) for minutes of May 17 and Oct. 4, 2002.

VI. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Gerlach stated he had some urgent new business to bring to the floor. He wanted to move this subject to the consideration of the University Well-Being Committee and our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council for their consideration and possible action. This report had come out of the Ohio Retired Teachers' Association, and should alarm us all. It was reported in their Fall 2002 newsletter. House Bill 173 sponsored by Representative Calbert established the Ohio Technology Fund. HB173 if passed, would take \$60 million from each of four retirement systems, which included the State Teachers' Retirement, the public employees, and the Bureau of Workmen's Compensation to fund venture capital investments in high technology startup businesses in the state of Ohio. Some legislators still thought that the retirement benefits were paid by state taxes and could be shifted around like the state budget. They needed to be enlightened that this was our retirement fund, funded by our contributions and was not related to state taxes. It alarmed him that anyone would raid

our retirement funds on the presumption that they were borrowing from them and would return the money with interest when this kind of scheme suggested all could be lost. Why they should take it from these funds in the first place was beyond him. He thought it was simply a subject that he would move that our Well-Being Committee and our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council take under action.

This motion was seconded by Senator Gunn. No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of the motion.

VII. ADJOURNMENT - The Chair then called for a motion to adjourn. This was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin